

Global Concessional Financing Facility Technical Advisory Group Meeting

March 9, 2026, by Video Conference

Summary of Meeting

Introductory Remarks

The Co-Chairs of the meeting, Ms. **Mayumi Moteki**, Deputy Director, MDBs Division, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance, Japan and Mr. **Maher Abdelrahim**, Head of Division, World Bank Division, MOPIC, welcomed participants to the TAG meeting. Mr. **Abdelrahim** informed the members, that the meeting is focused on one agenda item-*Presentation and discussion of the Draft Independent Evaluation Report*.

Item for Presentation/Discussion: Draft Independent Evaluation Report

Ms. **Moteki**, welcomed the Independent Evaluation team- Ipsos and Gobin Global. This was followed by Ms. **Jade Ndiaye**, Program Manager GCFE Coordination Unit, with an overview of the Independent Evaluation timelines and next steps for the finalisation of the Report. *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment)*.

Ms. **Moteki**, then invited Ipsos representative Ms. **Jessica Bruce** for a presentation on the conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation *(Please find copy of presentation in attachment)*.

This was followed by Breakout Sessions on the recommendations and a Validation Plenary Session facilitated by Ipsos-Gobin Global. *(Please see overview of comments in Annex-1)*.

Ms. **Moteki** thanked Ipsos for the consultative session and requested TAG members to provide any additional written feedback to the Coordination Unit by 10 March 2026.

Any other Business/ Closing Remarks by Co-Chairs

The Co-Chairs Ms. **Moteki** and Mr. **Abdelrahim**, reminded TAG members to provide their preferred dates for the in-person Steering Committee meeting to the Coordination Unit by 16 March. The Co-Chairs thanked members for a productive discussions and closed the meeting.

Annex-1

Breakout Session Feedback on Recommendations Draft Independent Evaluation Report

Discussion on strategic positioning and funding predictability recommendations

Both groups agreed on recommendation 1, affirming that the GCFF should maintain its core principles as its primary value proposition. Group 1 suggested strengthening the recommendation by identifying the minimum funding needed for the GCFF to function and by providing greater detail on future options. Group 2 found the operationalisation points unclear and called for further elaboration, while also emphasising that projects reaching the Steering Committee should be the right ones. Group 2 additionally noted that the GCFF should remain open to new crises as they emerge, and that there is an opportunity to better communicate the GCFF's values beyond its funding features.

There was equally strong agreement on recommendation 2, with both groups supporting a shift toward a knowledge-sharing and convening platform model. Group 1 welcomed the direction but cautioned that implementation could prove burdensome in practice, suggesting the focus be centred on learnings around sustainability. Group 2 concurred, noting that other funds are already moving in this direction, while highlighting a gap in the type of learning the GCFF could realistically generate — an area that warrants further consideration.

Discussion on governance structures and portfolio-level steering recommendations

Participants agreed that the GCFF's lean governance structure is a key strength, and that any improvements should avoid adding new layers or reporting burdens. While there was broad support for strengthening portfolio-level risk discussions — including volatility in the external environment and shifts in policy contexts — any new approaches should draw on existing information rather than introducing additional reporting requirements. Structured opportunities for MDBs and implementing partners to share perspectives on portfolio risks within SC and TAG meetings were seen as valuable, though concerns were raised that biannual reporting could be challenging where progress is slow or unfolds over longer time horizons.

On the proposed refugee inclusion alignment rating, participants expressed caution, noting it could be politically sensitive and risk positioning the GCFF as passing judgement on host country policies — which was seen as inconsistent with the Facility's intended role. The recommendation to clarify the role and functions of Country Coordination Committees was received more positively, with participants noting that clearer guidance could strengthen coordination while preserving the flexibility needed to adapt arrangements to specific country contexts.

Discussion on portfolio design, instruments and results recommendations

Several recommendations and operational options were seen as formalising processes that already occur informally, which may make implementation more feasible, though some clarifications are still needed — for example, what is meant by "structured engagement of UNHCR." Key priorities

identified included early pipeline development and ensuring projects deliver meaningful refugee inclusion outcomes. On the latter, it was suggested that the operational option requiring Funding Requests to explain instrument alignment with refugee inclusion outcomes should be reconsidered, as instrument selection is shaped by a range of factors beyond inclusion objectives alone.

On resourcing, concern was raised that many operational options would fall to the Coordination Unit, potentially stretching capacity. Similarly, UNHCR's involvement at key project cycle stages was noted to depend on its available capacity, linking to broader findings on country-level coordination. Participants emphasised that recommendations should avoid placing additional burden on MDBs. In terms of prioritisation, recommendations 1 and 7 were seen as more pressing than recommendation 6, and within recommendation 5, the first three operational options were considered more likely to drive impact than the one relating to enhanced UNHCR engagement.

Discussion on financial architecture and resource mobilization recommendations

On recommendation 7, there was broad agreement that the credibility gap is real, though views diverged on how to address it. Donor representatives were generally open to dropping the IDA benchmark and adjusting the concessionality framework, while Benefitting Countries were more cautious about anything perceived as reducing headline concessionality — even though in practice they already receive far less than the current design implies. The key distinction that adjusting the framework would not translate into lower actual transfers proved difficult to communicate clearly, likely due to time constraints.

The proposed 10–15% range was broadly seen as fair, though participants called for clearer justification of the underlying logic. The idea of introducing a minimum concessionality floor to protect Benefitting countries was well received conceptually, though its feasibility under declining funding conditions remains uncertain. Rules-based tiers linked to refugee burden indicators were seen as technically sound but of limited practical relevance, given that window allocations tend to reflect donor priorities more than project quality.